

### **REMARKS**

Claim 6 has been amended to overcome the outstanding objection, and claims 1 and 12 have been amended to better define the present invention over the cited reference.


Claims 1 and 12-14 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Glinz '976. Applicants traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) varying a cross-sectional area of an annular cavity portion by changing the shape of the annular shell in the circumferential direction, as in amended claims 1 and 12.

Glinz merely discloses a tire and a run flat support member. The cavity portion created by the tire and run-flat support member is constant in the circumferential direction. Applicants dispute that a conventional tire would have an annular cavity that is not substantially constant over the circumferential extent of the tire, and applicants do not understand the examiner's suggestion that claim 1 be amended to positively require a tire having circumferential variation. In any event, the examiner does not assert that circumferential changes in the shape of the run-flat member of Glinz causes a change in the cross-sectional area of the annular cavity portion, so the present amendment of claims 1 and 12 clearly avoids the cited reference. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

May 30, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978